

FINAL REPORT

CCW IMPOUNDMENTS INSPECTION REPORT

GORGAS STEAM PLANT WALKER COUNTY, ALABAMA

PREPARED FOR:

*U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY
WASHINGTON, DC*

UNDER SUBCONTRACT TO:

*LOCKHEED MARTIN
EDISON, NJ*

**Engineering & Construction Management
Hydro-Nuclear-Fossil**

Geotechnical Engineering

Seismic and Structural Engineering

Hydrological & Hydraulic Engineering

Tunnel Engineering

Environmental Engineering & Permitting

PAUL C. RIZZO ASSOCIATES, INC.
101 WESTPARK BOULEVARD, SUITE B
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA USA 29210

**PROJECT NO. 09-4157
SEPTEMBER 2009**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	v
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 GENERAL	1
1.2 SUMMARY OF FIELD INSPECTION FINDINGS	2
1.3 SUMMARY OF O&M STATUS	3
1.4 CONCLUSIONS.....	3
1.4.1 Project Description	3
1.4.2 Field Inspection	3
1.5 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	4
1.6 CERTIFICATION	4
1.6.1 List of All Field Inspection Participants.....	4
1.6.2 Signature of Independent Engineer	5
1.6.3 PE Stamp	5
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	6
2.1 EXISTING PROJECT FEATURES AND HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION	6
2.1.1 Rattlesnake Dam and Ash Pond	6
2.1.2 Gypsum Ponds.....	8
2.2 SUMMARY OF STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES	10
2.2.1 Purpose of the Project.....	10
2.2.2 Current Inspection Schedule.....	11
2.3 MODIFICATIONS CONDUCTED FOR PROJECT SAFETY	11
2.4 ENGINEERING INFORMATION.....	11
2.4.1 Slope Stability Analyses.....	12
2.4.2 Hydrologic Analyses	13

3.0	FIELD INSPECTION	14
3.1	FIELD INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS	14
3.1.1	Rattlesnake Dam.....	14
3.1.2	Gypsum Ponds.....	16
3.2	STATUS OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN LAST ANNUAL INSPECTION.....	16
3.2.1	Sapling Removal	17
3.2.2	Maintenance of a Clear Zone at Dam Toe.....	17
4.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	18
4.1	RECOMMENDATION NO. 1	18
4.2	RECOMMENDATION NO. 2.....	18
4.3	RECOMMENDATION NO. 3.....	19
4.4	RECOMMENDATION NO. 4.....	19
4.5	RECOMMENDATION NO. 5.....	19

TABLES

FIGURES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
TABLE 1 -1	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	4
TABLE 2 -1	RATTLESNAKE DAM LOCATION DATA	8
TABLE 2 -2	GYPSUM PONDS LOCATION DATA	9

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE
FIGURE 1	USGS VICINITY MAP
FIGURE 2	RATTLESNAKE HOLLOW ASH POND AND FEATURES
FIGURE 3	RATTLESNAKE DAM AND FEATURES
FIGURE 4	GYPSUM PONDS AND FEATURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE
APPENDIX A	PHOTO LOG
APPENDIX B	FIGURES
APPENDIX C	INSPECTION CHECKLISTS

**CCW IMPOUNDMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT
WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS ELECTRIC
GENERATING PLANT
WALKER COUNTY, ALABAMA
PROJECT NO. 09-4157**

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 GENERAL

This Section is a summary of the Independent Engineer's Review of Management Units for the William Crawford Gorgas Electric Generating Plant (Gorgas). The Report was prepared by Paul C. Rizzo Associates Inc. (RIZZO) for the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under subcontract to Lockheed Martin. This Section summarizes the finding, assessments, conclusions and recommendations of the Independent Engineer.

The Gorgas plant is a coal fired power plant located on the north bank of the Black Warrior River in Parrish, Walker County, Alabama owned and operated by Alabama Power Company (APC). Under normal operating conditions, byproducts of coal combustion including fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, flue gas emission control residuals, and other general wastewater products are sluiced into a storage basin south of the plant impounded by Rattlesnake Dam, a rockfill embankment structure with an upper RCC facing block. In addition, gypsum byproducts are sluiced and stored in a basin northwest of the plant consisting of a gypsum storage pond and a series of clarification basins.

The ash pond dam, called Rattlesnake Dam, was originally constructed as a random rockfill structure in 1954 using local borrow materials. The original structure was raised and made larger in 1979, and then raised once again in 2007. Along with raising the ash pond dam in 2007, a series of gypsum and clarification ponds were built. For the purposes of this assessment, Rattlesnake Dam and the Gypsum Ponds have been classified as significant hazard potential structures. Significant hazard potential structures are classified as structures where failure is not likely to result in loss of life, but may cause significant

economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. The predominant risk of failure for Rattlesnake Dam and the Gypsum Ponds is environmental damage.

1.2 SUMMARY OF FIELD INSPECTION FINDINGS

The site inspection was conducted on June 9, 2009. The inspection team consisted of representatives from APC, Southern Company, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM), Balch and Bingham, the USEPA, and RIZZO. The team stopped at each of the Project features to inspect the structures and the surrounding area. Particular attention was paid to site features that may contribute to typical failure modes of embankment structures such as settlement, seepage, and slope stability.

The rockfill embankment forming Rattlesnake Dam and the associated spillway, weir flow discharge structure, and associated piping were found to be well maintained and in good condition at the time of inspection. The dam exhibits little seepage, with the only seepage noted at the time of inspection occurring just to the right of the maximum section at the dam toe. According to site personnel, a small pond at the downstream toe of the maximum section of the structure was built during the initial construction of the Project. APC has not definitively quantified the water source for this pond but believes that it is influenced by both seepage and the adjacent river. RIZZO concurs with this assessment.

The Gypsum Ponds consist of four structures: the gypsum storage basin; a sedimentation basin; and two clear pools, one of which is designated for extra/emergency storage. The recently constructed gypsum storage basin and three associated sedimentation/clarification pools were found to be in good condition at the time of inspection, with no signs of distress, settlement, or instability noted. The gypsum ponds are provided with impermeable liners, with flow carried from pool to pool by a system of decant pipes and a concrete lined open channel connecting the gypsum storage pond and the sedimentation basin.

1.3 SUMMARY OF O&M STATUS

The Project is attended full time by plant operators and dedicated safety personnel. The current inspection schedule for the structures consists of redacted . The inspection for Rattlesnake Dam includes surveying of a series of six monuments positioned along the crest of the Dam embedded in the upstream RCC facing block. No other instrumentation has been provided at Rattlesnake Dam or the Gypsum Ponds.

At the time of inspection, the structures and the Plant appeared to be well maintained and in good working order. Currently, neither the Rattlesnake Dam nor the Gypsum Ponds are regulated by state or federal dam safety programs.

1.4 CONCLUSIONS

1.4.1 Project Description

The Gorgas Power Plant is a coal fired power plant. CCW byproducts of coal combustion are sluiced to on site storage ponds which appear to be well maintained and operated.

The last major revisions to the CCW storage structures include a raise of Rattlesnake Dam to provide more storage and the construction of the Gypsum Ponds, both of which occurred in 2007. Designs for the recent construction projects were developed by APC, Southern Company employees. The structures are not regulated by any state or federal dam safety programs. redacted

1.4.2 Field Inspection

Field inspection was performed in light of EPA guidelines and typical embankment failure modes. Minor seepage was noted at one location at the toe of Rattlesnake Dam, and an area of poor vegetative cover was noted on the downslope between the gypsum storage pond and sedimentation/clear pools at the Gypsum Ponds. Recommendations were

developed based on field observations and technical review of Project documentation provided by APC.

1.5 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

There were a total of five recommendations resulting from the document review and field inspection. The Recommendations are summarized below in **Table 1-1** and discussed in detail in **Section 4.0**.

TABLE 1-1: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

NO.	RECOMMENDATION	TIMEFRAME
1	Institute Formal Monthly Visual Inspection Program.	Summer 2009
2	Improve Condition of Seepage Monitoring Weir at Toe of Rattlesnake Dam	Summer 2009
3	Monitor Developing Cracks in RCC at Rattlesnake Dam.	Concurrent with redacted Inspections.
4	Maintain Vegetation on Slopes of Gypsum Ponds	According to Owner's Existing Plan.
5	Continued Vegetation Control on Slopes and Toe of Rattlesnake Dam	As Required by 2008 Inspection Report.

1.6 CERTIFICATION

1.6.1 List of All Field Inspection Participants

The field inspection was conducted on June 9, 2009. The individuals participating in the inspection were:

Karrie-Jo Shell	USEPA
H. Grady Adkins, PE	RIZZO – Independent Engineer
John P. Osterle, PE	RIZZO
Conrad Ginther, EIT	RIZZO
Jim Courington	Gorgas – Alabama Power
Tracie Hill	Gorgas – Alabama Power


Susan Mayfield	Gorgas – Alabama Power
Jerry Mitchell	Gorgas – Alabama Power
Shane Lovett	ADEM
Scott Story	ADEM
Scott Ramsey	ADEM
Edward Poolos	ADEM
Steven Burns, Esq.	Balch and Bingham
Tommy Ryals	APC Environmental Affairs
Jim Pegues	Southern Company

1.6.2 Signature of Independent Engineer

I acknowledge that the management units referenced herein were personally inspected by me and was found to be in the following condition:

SATISFACTORY

Signature:

 9/14/09
 H. Grady Adkins, PE,
 AL Registration No. 28790
 Independent Engineer
 Paul C. Rizzo Associates, Inc.

1.6.3 PE Stamp



2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 EXISTING PROJECT FEATURES AND HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

2.1.1 Rattlesnake Dam and Ash Pond

Rattlesnake Dam is identified as a Significant Hazard structure with the ID “AL 01662” in the National Inventory of Dams. It is also referred to as Rattlesnake Hollow Dam.

Rattlesnake Dam was originally constructed as a random rockfill berm with a crest elevation of approximately ^{redacted} feet, referred to in the provided documentation and drawings as “Stage 1”. Limited details of the original construction or foundation preparation were available at the time of inspection. In the mid 1970’s, the dam was raised to crest elevation ^{redacted} feet (Stage 2). The Stage 2 crest raise consisted of excavation and removal of ash that had collected against the rockfill face of the Dam, the construction of an upstream blanket intended to limit seepage through the existing and new rockfill, placement of an intermediate sized material intended to act as a filter between the impermeable material and rockfill, and the placement of additional rockfill on the downstream shell. According to documents provided by APC, the construction of the upstream seepage blanket and intermediate filter was difficult due to the craggy surface provided by the existing rockfill surface. The Stage 2 crest raise appears to have been largely successful at reducing seepage through the structure, with only one location of notable seepage at a location around 150 feet west and downstream of the concrete culvert that had previously served as the diversion channel for the original construction. This seepage feature generally coincides with the location of seepage noted at the time of inspection, and is estimated to be on the order of five gallons per minute.

In 2005, as the storage capacity of the ash pond dwindled, a feasibility study was performed to determine the available methods to raise the existing dam and the associated risks and costs of a second crest increase. The study consisted of historical document reviews, field exploration including a two phase geophysical testing program, test pits and other field sampling, and seepage and slope stability analysis of existing and proposed conditions. The resulting Report, “Crest Raise Feasibility Study”, issued in October 2005 was provided by APC at the time of inspection. As a result of the Feasibility Study, a

cross section consisting of a ^{redacted} foot wide RCC facing block with a design slope of ^{redacted}, a core section up to ^{redacted} feet thick, a ^{redacted} foot thick fine and coarse filter section, and additional rockfill placed on the downstream shell to provide a downstream slope of ^{redacted}. ^{redacted} was selected for the crest raise project (Stage 3), with a design crest elevation of ^{redacted} feet. According to provided calculations, it was estimated that raising the crest an additional ^{redacted} feet would provide on the order of ^{redacted} of additional ash storage.

Documentation reviewed as a part of the inspection included the previously mentioned feasibility study, design stability calculations performed using the program Slope/W and performed for normal, seismic, and flood loading conditions, and the construction drawings for the crest raise project. The review of these documents did not include a detailed check of calculations however, assumptions made in the analysis such as loading conditions and material properties were well documented and the assumptions and results of the analyses appeared reasonable to the reviewers.

The Stage 3 construction at Rattlesnake Dam was completed in 2007, and consisted of removal and replacement of the weir flow intake structure used to control water levels at normal conditions, a ^{redacted} feet raise of the dam crest using the typical section mentioned above, and the construction of a two bay emergency spillway with a spill elevation of ^{redacted} feet designed to pass the PMF without overtopping of the structure. The RCC facing block was installed using a paving machine without the use of water stops at construction joints and with few measures to control cracking in the RCC. The current dam crest elevation is ^{redacted} feet, and the approximate height of the dam is ^{redacted} feet.

In addition to the crest raise, an intermediate dike was constructed in the ash pond to facilitate better water quality at the discharge by limiting the travel of ash in the pond. This dike extends from the east side of the pond nearly all the way to the west side, where a narrow channel allows water to flow to Rattlesnake Dam and through the discharge structure. An HDPE bubbler line has been added in the channel to provide extra water quality treatment.

Currently, CCW byproducts are sluiced from the Gorgas combustion units, under the Black Warrior River, to the far southern (upstream) extremity of the ash pond via HDPE sluice lines. Discharge water travels through the channel at the intermediate dike and to

the weir flow intake structure near the right abutment of Rattlesnake Dam, where a four feet diameter line carries flow to the discharge point in the river. The discharge from the ash pond is regulated by the Alabama Department of Environmental Management under NPDES Permit #AL0002909.

According to information provided by APC, the Ash Pond has an approximate area of ^{redacted} acres, is holding approximately redacted cubic yards of CCW, and has an approximate storage capacity of redacted cubic yards of CCW.

Based on field reconnaissance and a review of USGS maps and aerial photographs, Rattlesnake Dam has been classified by the Independent Engineer as a significant hazard potential structure due to the environmental damage that would be caused by misoperation or failure of the structure. *Table 2-1* below summarizes the location information for Rattlesnake Dam.

TABLE 2-1: RATTLESNAKE DAM LOCATION DATA

	DEGREES	MINUTES	SECONDS
Longitude	-87	11	08
Latitude	33	38	23
State:	Alabama	County:	Walker

2.1.2 Gypsum Ponds

The Gypsum Ponds were constructed in 2007 and consist of a gypsum storage basin, a sediment basin, and two clear pools, one of which is used for emergency storage. All of the Gypsum Ponds are lined with a 60 mil HPDE welded liner and the gypsum storage pond is provided with underdrains.

The gypsum storage cell is the largest of the four ponds, and is partially incised into a hilltop and partially diked. According to documentation provided by APC, the hilltop the embankment is constructed on is at least partially comprised of coal mine spoil materials. The stability analyses provided by APC appear to have accounted for this foundation condition appropriately. The embankment is up to ^{redacted} high on the slope between the

gypsum storage pond and lower ponds, with a crest elevation of ^{redacted} feet. Inside and outside slopes of the basin are constructed at ^{redacted}, with an intermediate bench provided to either side of the crest at elevation ^{redacted} feet. A decant pipe carries water from the center of the pond through the embankment to a concrete lined trapezoidal channel that ties into the sedimentation pond via several 36 inch diameter concrete pipes. The decant structure in the storage basin is constructed such that as gypsum accumulates risers can be added to the structure to rise the decant elevation in 4 foot intervals. The lowest decant elevation provided in the pond is ^{redacted}, approximately ^{redacted} higher than the low point of the pond bottom. Gypsum slurry is pumped from a low point below the clear pool to the northern extremity of the gypsum storage pond.

According to information provided by APC, the gypsum storage pond has an approximate area of ^{redacted}, is holding approximately ^{redacted} cubic yards of gypsum, and has an approximate storage capacity of ^{redacted} cubic yards of gypsum.

The sediment pond, clear pool, and emergency storage cell were ^{redacted} and have interior slopes of ^{redacted}. Two decant pipes carry water from the sediment pond to the clear pool under normal conditions. In addition, concrete lined overflow spillways connect the sediment pond to the clear pool and the clear pool to the emergency storage cell.

Documentation reviewed as a part of the inspection included design stability calculations performed using the program Slope/W and performed for normal, seismic, and flood loading conditions, and the construction drawings for the Gypsum Ponds. The review of these documents did not include a detailed check of calculations, however, assumptions made in the analysis such as loading conditions and material properties were well documented and the assumptions and results of the analyses appeared reasonable to the reviewers.

Based on field reconnaissance and a review of USGS maps and aerial photographs, the Gypsum Ponds (the gypsum storage pond in particular) have been classified by the Independent Engineer as a significant hazard potential structure due to the environmental damage that would be caused by misoperation or failure of the structure. **Table 2-2** below summarizes the location information for the Gypsum Ponds.

TABLE 2-2: GYPSUM POND LOCATION DATA

	DEGREES	MINUTES	SECONDS
Longitude	-87	13	02
Latitude	33	39	19
State:	Alabama	County:	Walker

2.2 SUMMARY OF STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

2.2.1 Purpose of the Project

The Gorgas Plant is a coal fired power plant. Rattlesnake Dam was constructed to provide storage for waste coal combustion products and to provide necessary decantation capacity for the discharge water from the plant to comply with NPDES permit requirements. The Gypsum Ponds were constructed to provide storage for gypsum created as a byproduct of emissions scrubbing. Recent additions to the structure of Rattlesnake Dam have added an estimated additional storage capacity for on the order of redacted more ash production.

To date there have been no failures, overtopping events, or uncontrolled releases into the Black Warrior River from Rattlesnake Dam or the Gypsum Ponds. This assessment does not include discharges already recorded in NPDES records.

2.2.2 Current Inspection Schedule

The current inspection schedule for the structures at Gorgas is as follows:

redacted

2.3 MODIFICATIONS CONDUCTED FOR PROJECT SAFETY

In 2007 the Gypsum Ponds were constructed and Rattlesnake Dam was raised ^{redacted} feet. These construction projects were related to production capacity rather than dam safety improvements. ^{redacted}

2.4 ENGINEERING INFORMATION

The following documents provided by APC were reviewed in the preparation of this Report:

1. Rattlesnake Hollow Ash Pond Dam – Raise Crest Feasibility Study;
2. ^{redacted}
3. ^{redacted}
4. ^{redacted}
5. ^{redacted}
6. General Technical Specifications For Earthwork for New Gypsum Storage Facility at Gorgas Steam Plant;
7. Technical Specifications for Earthwork and Roller Compacted Concrete Crest Raise Construction –Plant Gorgas - Rattlesnake Hollow Ash Pond Dam;
8. Construction Drawings for Gypsum Storage Ponds;
9. ^{redacted}
10. ^{redacted}
11. Alabama Power Company Responses to EPA Questions Regarding Management of Coal Combustion By-Products. Doc Control No. GOR-API-0033 & 0034;
12. Final Permit, NPDES Permit Number: AL0002909; and
13. Plant Gorgas – Overview Photos.

2.4.1 Slope Stability Analyses

The recommended minimum factors of safety for dams contained in the “Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspections of Dams” (US Army Corps of Engineers ER-1110-2-106) are:

- Steady State Seepage Condition: 1.5;
- Sudden Drawdown Condition – 1.2; and
- Steady State Seepage with Seismic – 1.0

For the Ash Pond, stability analyses were performed on both the pre-raise embankment and the post-raise embankment. Both upstream and downstream sections were analyzed for stability under steady state seepage and seismic loading conditions. Stability analyses resulted in the following factors of safety.

STABILITY ANALYSES RESULTS

EMBANKMENT SECTION	PRE-RAISE		POST-RAISE	
	STEADY STATE	SEISMIC	STEADY STATE	SEISMIC
Upstream	2.24	1.82	1.94	1.61
Downstream	1.54	1.36	1.43	1.27

The Sudden Drawdown Condition is normally computed from the spillway crest to the pool level. In the case of this Dam, this is only a difference of redacted and would not be expected to be a critical loading condition.

For the Gypsum Storage Pond, the stability of the embankment was analyzed for the following conditions:

- Ponded Water with and without seismic load;
- Ponded Gypsum with and without seismic load; and
- Full Gypsum Stack with and without seismic load.

For each of these conditions, the factor of safety under static load was 1.88 and the factor of safety with seismic load was 1.64. A review of the calculations showed that no phreatic line within the embankment was considered. This is considered a valid assumption as long as the impermeable liner functions as designed.

2.4.2 Hydrologic Analyses

A Hydrologic Study for the Ash Pond Drainage Basin was completed by Southern Company Services in November 2005, as a part of the crest raise of the Ash Pond. Inflow hydrographs for the 6-hour 100-year and the 6-hour Probable Maximum Precipitation were developed and floodrouted through the planned spillway system using the SCS TR-20 Program. The results of this analysis are summarized below.

Normal Pool at Start of Storm	Redacted
Maximum Pool Stage from 100-yr Rainfall	
Maximum Pool Stage from PMPr Rainfall	
Crest of Dam	

The Gypsum Storage facility is located such that it has no drainage area and the only water that enters the basin is pumped in or rainfall that falls directly into the pond. Water exits the pond through two decant risers. No hydrologic or hydraulic calculations for these risers were found. The storm drainage system that carries runoff from the top of the gypsum storage area to the sedimentation basins is designed for a 25-year 24-hour storm event.

Based on the field inspection and review of the submitted documents, RIZZO concurs with the methods and conclusions of the hydrologic studies.

3.0 FIELD INSPECTION

3.1 FIELD INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS

The site inspection was conducted on June 9, 2009. The inspection team consisted of representatives from APC, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM), Balch and Bingham, Southern Company, the USEPA, and RIZZO. The team stopped at each of the Project features to inspect the structures and the surrounding area. Particular attention was paid to site features that may contribute to typical failure modes of embankment structures such as settlement, seepage, and slope stability. Photographs taken during the site inspection can be reviewed in *Appendix A*.

The individuals participating in the inspection were:

Karrie-Jo Shell	USEPA
H. Grady Adkins, PE	RIZZO – Independent Engineer
John P. Osterle, PE	RIZZO
Conrad Ginther, EIT	RIZZO
Jim Courington	Gorgas Plant – APC
Tracie Hill	Gorgas Plant – APC
Susan Mayfield	Gorgas Plant – APC
Jerry Mitchell	Gorgas Plant – APC
Shane Lovett	ADEM
Scott Story	ADEM
Scott Ramsey	ADEM
Edward Poolos	ADEM
Steven Burns, Esq.	Balch and Bingham
Tommy Ryals	APC Environmental Affairs
Jim Pegues	Southern Company

3.1.1 Rattlesnake Dam

At the time of inspection, Rattlesnake Dam appeared to be well maintained and in good condition. The crest of the structure appeared well maintained and showed no signs of settlement or rutting. The upstream slope was not visible below the recently constructed RCC facing block. The downstream slope appeared to be uniformly graded, without signs

of sloughing or sliding. The abutment contacts appeared to be in good condition downstream and where visible upstream.

Vertical cracking was noted in the upstream face of the RCC near the intake weir and right abutment (*See Photo 6*). According to APC personnel, no construction joints were placed in the RCC facing between the abutments – a distance of approximately ^{redacted} feet. No area of concentrated vertical cracking was noted elsewhere on the RCC facing. The existing cracks should be monitored for change in size as part of the inspection program. The left abutment is flatter than the right abutment but may be subject to cracking due to future differential settlement. Observation of the front face of the RCC for cracking should be included in periodic inspection checklists.

The weir intake structure is a new reinforced concrete structure in excellent condition. This structure outlets into a 48-inch diameter corrugated metal pipe that carries decant water down the hill to the NPDES permitted release point. The release point is under water; therefore observation of the water at the point of discharge was not visible. Water at the point of entry was clear water. (*See Photo 2*).

The auxiliary spillway consists of twin box culverts through the embankment discharging into a baffle chute spillway with a rock lined trapezoidal discharge channel (tailrace) below the chute stilling basin. This spillway was constructed in 2007 and is in excellent condition. It has not experienced flow to date.

The downstream face of the dam is rockfill with no signs of sloughing or sliding. The color difference in the photographs between the upper lighter colored rock and the lower darker colored rock is indicative of difference in exposure time between the new construction in 2007 and the older rock placed in the 1970's rather than an indication of seepage.

The downstream toe is generally grassed and clear of trees and heavy vegetation, with the exception of areas of tall brush in areas difficult to reach with tractor mowers. Seepage was noted below the toe in the left abutment area. The area around the pond in the center portion of the dam appears to be continuously wet from seepage and tailwater from the river. The pond was built during the initial dam construction. Wet areas and standing

water in tractor ruts were noted in the cleared area downstream of the dam. All were seeps of clear water with no cloudiness or indication of soil movement and may have been hillside seepage from recent rainfall.

The intermediate dike was observed from a distance and not walked. This dike serves as a baffle to enhance water quality, and with a crest elevation only slightly above normal pool, is not considered a safety risk to Rattlesnake Dam.

3.1.2 Gypsum Ponds

The Gypsum Ponds complex consists of the gypsum storage pond at the upper elevation and the sediment basin and two clear pools at the lower elevation. These engineered earthfill structures are lined with HDPE welded liners and were constructed in 2007. There is no moisture on exposed slopes that would be indicative of seepage.

At the time of the inspection, the ponds appeared to be well constructed, operated, and maintained.

The ponds were found to have smooth, even, well graded slopes with spotty vegetation on the exterior slopes. The lack of grass cover is attributed to the recent regional drought since the slopes were seeded after construction. This has resulted in areas of surface erosion on the slopes as shown in (*Photos 34, 35, and 36*). According to APC personnel, repairs to the slope erosion and vegetation are redacted . The erosion is not an immediate threat to the embankments, but should be addressed before it becomes a problem. The redacted slope and vegetation repairs should help solve the threat.

3.2 STATUS OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN LAST ANNUAL INSPECTION

redacted

In general, the inspection found no indications of concern for dam safety and as such the two recommendations are minor in nature.

3.2.1 Sapling Removal

Recommendation:

Small saplings in rockfill dam should be removed or treated by spraying herbicide.

Status:

At the time of inspection, rockfill slopes of Rattlesnake Dam appeared free of excessive vegetation, brush, and saplings.

3.2.2 Maintain a Clear Zone at Dam Toe

Recommendation:

Vegetation along toe should be cleared to a distance of 20 feet from the dam toe. This clearing should be maintained to the extent necessary to allow inspection.

Status:

At the time of inspection, the area was generally clear of heavy vegetation, with the exception of some areas of tall brush or grass in areas that appeared hard to reach with a mowing tractor. The area immediately downstream of the toe in the center portion of the Dam appears to stay wet and consequently is difficult to mow.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

A total of five recommendations were generated during the preparation of this Inspection Report. All of the Recommendations are considered dam safety items. Each recommendation is presented below along with a proposed schedule to address the Recommendation.

4.1 RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

It is recommended that the visual inspections performed by redacted be formalized in a monthly monitoring program. The program should consist of visual observation of slope conditions, general maintenance items such as vegetation control, and changes/appearances of seepage flow for both Rattlesnake Dam and the Gypsum Ponds and should include observations of any changes in depth, area, or other conditions of the toe pool and of changes in the volume of seepage at the existing seep in Rattlesnake Dam. A simple log sheet should be developed to facilitate easy reference and availability of the information for any future inspections, improvements, or remediations.

Schedule: Summer 2009

4.2 RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

In conjunction with Recommendation No. 1, the existing weir box at the toe of the downstream slope of Rattlesnake Dam should be cleaned out and repositioned, or replaced with a larger weir if necessary, to collect the seepage flow along the downstream toe observed at the time of inspection. As much of the seepage currently visible should be collected as possible and the small ditch creating the current flow path should be kept as clear as possible to facilitate observations of changes in volume, turbidity, or location of new seeps. Such information, along with the flow measured at the box should be recorded as a part of Recommendation No. 1, so that seepage trends can be established and reviewed easily. In the event of increased seepage flows, the installation of additional instrumentation and a more involved monitoring program may be warranted.

Schedule: In conjunction with Recommendation No. 1.

4.3 RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

It is recommended that cracks in the RCC facing block of Rattlesnake Dam be monitored as they develop, and that remedial measures such as caulking or grouting be considered to treat the cracks if they are deemed a risk to the embankment materials during normal conditions or high pool events.

Schedule: Concurrent with Annual Inspections.

4.4 RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

It is recommended that the slopes between the gypsum storage cell and the clarification basins be reseeded or otherwise provided with good vegetative cover to prevent excessive raveling of the slopes. It is our understanding that APC has a plan in place to restore and establish cover on the slopes in the near future.

Schedule: According to existing plans.

4.5 RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

It is recommended that efforts to control vegetation in the rockfill slopes and within 20 feet of the downstream toe of Rattlesnake Dam be continued as indicated in the last annual Inspection Report.

Schedule: Per the recommendations of the 2008 Report of redacted Dam Safety Inspection.

APPENDIX A

GOR GAS STEAM PLANT PHOTO LOG

PHOTO 1: RATTLESNAKE DAM WEIR FLOW INTAKE STRUCTURE



PHOTO 2: CLOSEUP OF WEIR INTAKE



**PHOTO 3: EMERGENCY SPILLWAY AND UPSTREAM FACE OF
RATTLESNAKE DAM**

redacted

PHOTO 4: RATTLESNAKE DAM LEFT ABUTMENT UPSTREAM CONTACT

redacted

PHOTO 5: RATTLESNAKE DAM RIGHT ABUTMENT UPSTREAM CONTACT

redacted

**PHOTO 6: VERTICAL CRACKING IN RCC FACING BLOCK LEFT OF
INTAKE STRUCTURE**

redacted

**PHOTO 7: RCC FACING ON UPSTREAM SIDE OF RATTLESNAKE DAM
(LOOKING SW)**

redacted

**PHOTO 8: RCC FACING ON UPSTREAM SIDE OF RATTLESNAKE DAM
(LOOKING NE)**

redacted

**PHOTO 9: RATTLESNAKE DAM DOWNSTREAM SLOPE FROM LEFT
ABUTMENT (LOOKING SW)**

redacted

**PHOTO 10: RATTLESNAKE DAM DOWNSTREAM SLOPE FROM LEFT
ABUTMENT (LOOKING NE)**

redacted

redacted

PHOTO 12: EMERGENCY SPILLWAY (FROM DAM CREST, LOOKING N)

redacted

PHOTO 26: RIP RAP LINED SPILLWAY TAILRACE (LOOKING N)

redacted

PHOTO 13: DISCHARGE LINE FROM INTAKE STRUCTURE (LOOKING NW)

redacted

**PHOTO 27: DISCHARGE LINE FROM RATTLESNAKE DAM TO BLACK
WARRIOR RIVER**



**PHOTO 28: DISCHARGE INTO BLACK WARRIOR RIVER
(NPDES PERMIT #xx)**

redacted

PHOTO 14: ORIGINAL BYPASS CHANNEL (ABANDONED)

redacted

**PHOTO 15: ORIGINAL BYPASS CHANNEL & CULVERT (ABANDONED,
LOOKING S)**



**PHOTO 16: POOL AT DOWNSTREAM TOE OF RATTLESNAKE DAM
(LOOKING W)**

redacted

**PHOTO 17: RATTLESNAKE DAM DOWNSTREAM SLOPE AND POOL AT
TOE**

redacted

PHOTO 18: OVERGROWN SEEPAGE MEASUREMENT WEIR



**PHOTO 19: APPROXIMATE SOURCE LOCATION OF SEEPAGE FROM
DOWNSTREAM TOE OF RATTLESNAKE DAM**

redacted

**PHOTO 29: VIEW ACROSS ASH POND FROM ADJACENT TO
INTERMEDIATE DIKE (LOOKING S)**

redacted

PHOTO 30: INTERMEDIATE DIKE IN ASH POND (LOOKING E)

redacted

redacted

**PHOTO 32: BUBBLER AERATION LINE AT INTERMEDIATE DIKE
(LOOKING E)**



PHOTO 33: GYPSUM STORAGE POND (LOOKING SE)

redacted

**PHOTO 34: SEDIMENT POND, BACKGROUND, AND CLEAR POOL,
FOREGROUND (LOOKING NE)**

redacted

PHOTO 35: DECANT PIPES IN SEDIMENT BASIN



PHOTO 36: EROSION ON SLOPE BETWEEN ASH BASIN AND CLEAR POOL

redacted

**PHOTO 37: SILT SOCK PLACED AS E & S CONTROL AT BASE OF ERODED
AREA**

redacted

PHOTO 38: PUMP STATION FROM CLEAR POOL

redacted

APPENDIX B

FIGURES

PLOT		DRAWN	CHG	CHECKED BY	CAD FILE
1=1	BY	6/21/09	APPROVED BY	NUMBER	09-4157-B2(M)




FIGURE 2
RATTLESNAKE HOLLOW
ASH POND AND FEATURES
GORGAS PLANT
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
PREPARED FOR

USEPA
WASHINGTON, D.C.

NOTE: DRAWING DIGITIZED FROM HARD COPY FIGURES. NTS.



- LEGEND**
- ① APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF SEEPAGE FROM TOE.
 - ② CRACKING IN RCC FACING BLOCK NOTED HERE.

FIGURE 3
RATTLESNAKE DAM
AND FEATURES
GORGAS PLANT
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
PREPARED FOR
USEPA
WASHINGTON, D.C.

NOTE: DRAWING DIGITIZED FROM HARD COPY FIGURES. NTS.

redacted

APPENDIX C

FIELD INSPECTION CHECKLISTS



Site Name:	Gorgas Steam Plant	Date:	06/09/2009
Unit Name:	Gypsum Storage Facility	Operator's Name:	Alabama Power Company
Unit I.D.:	Hazard Potential Classification: High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/>		
Inspector's Name: Grady Adkins, John Osterle, Conrad Ginther			

Check the appropriate box below. Provide comments when appropriate. If not applicable or not available, record "N/A". Any unusual conditions or construction practices that should be noted in the comments section. For large diked embankments, separate checklists may be used for different embankment areas. If separate forms are used, identify approximate area that the form applies to in comments.

	Yes	No		Yes	No
1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?		redacted	18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Pool elevation (operator records)?		Variable	19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Decant inlet elevation (operator records)?		Will vary	20. Decant Pipes:		
4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?		None	Is water entering inlet, but not exiting outlet?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?			Is water exiting outlet, but not entering inlet?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?			Is water exiting outlet flowing clear?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7. Is the embankment currently under construction?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):		
8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation, stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	From underdrain?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	At isolated points on embankment slopes?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Cracks or scarps on crest?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	At natural hillside in the embankment area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Over widespread areas?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		From downstream foundation area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	"Boils" beneath stream or ponded water?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Around the outside of the decant pipe?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23. Water against downstream toe?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Major adverse changes in these items could cause instability and should be reported for further evaluation. Adverse conditions noted in these items should normally be described (extent, location, volume, etc.) in the space below and on the back of this sheet.

Inspection Issue #

Comments

2&3 - Decant inlet will be raised in 4 ft increments as gypsum accumulates. *Lowest elevation*

6 - No instrumentation installed

19 - Localized surface erosion rills. Embankment was seeded after construction during drought conditions. *redacted*

Coal Combustion Waste (CCW)
Impoundment InspectionImpoundment NPDES Permit # N/A
Date 06/09/09INSPECTOR Adkins, Osterle
GintherImpoundment Name Gypsum Storage Facility
Impoundment Company Alabama Power Company
EPA Region IV
State Agency (Field Office) Address _____Name of Impoundment _____
(Report each impoundment on a separate form under the same Impoundment NPDES Permit number)*Entered service in 2007*

New _____ Update _____

	Yes	No
Is impoundment currently under construction?	_____	<u>X</u>
Is water or ccw currently being pumped into the impoundment? <i>No discharge at inspection date</i>	<u>X</u>	_____

IMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION: Gypsum StorageNearest Downstream Town : Name _____
Distance from the impoundment _____
Impoundment
Location: Longitude -87 Degrees 13 Minutes 02 Seconds
Latitude 33 Degrees 39 Minutes 19 Seconds
State AL County WalkerDoes a state agency regulate this impoundment? YES _____ NO X

If So Which State Agency? _____

Gypsum Pond

HAZARD POTENTIAL (In the event the impoundment should fail, the following would occur):

 LESS THAN LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Failure or misoperation of the dam results in no probable loss of human life or economic or environmental losses.

 LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the low hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the owner's property.


✓ **SIGNIFICANT HAZARD POTENTIAL:** Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard potential classification dams are often located in predominantly rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure.

 HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the high hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life.

DESCRIBE REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

Considered significant since failure would result in environmental damages from discharge into river - Property damage to owner's plant. Low probability of loss of life.

CONFIGURATION:



- ☐ Cross-Valley
- ☐ Side-Hill
- ☐ Diked
- ☐ Incised (form completion optional)
- ☒ Combination Incised/Diked

Embankment Height ^{redacted} _____ feet
 Pool Area _____ acres
 Current Freeboard _____ feet

Embankment Material Earth
 Liner 60mil HDPE
 Liner Permeability Very Low


TYPE OF OUTLET (Mark all that apply) *See next sheet*

Open Channel Spillway


- ☒ Trapezoidal
☐ Triangular
☐ Rectangular
☐ Irregular

3' depth
4' bottom (or average) width
16' top width


TRAPEZOIDAL




TRIANGULAR



RECTANGULAR



IRREGULAR




Outlet through embankment

48" inside diameter

Material

- ☐ corrugated metal
☐ welded steel
☒ concrete
☐ plastic (hdpe, pvc, etc.)
☐ other (specify) _____



Is water flowing through the outlet? YES ☒ NO ☐

☐ **No Outlet**

☐ **Other Type of Outlet (specify)** _____

The Impoundment was Designed By Southern Company

OUTLET WORKS – GORGAS STEAM PLANT GYPSUM STORAGE FACILITY

Decant water enters through two(2) 54-inch diameter HDPE riser structures and is carried through 36-inch diameter HDPE pipes to an 8-foot square reinforced concrete junction box that also collects water from the basin underdrains. From the junction box, the water flows in a 48-inch diameter RCP through the embankment into a concrete trapezoidal channel at the toe of the embankment. From the concrete channel the water flows into a sedimentation pond through three (3) 36-inch diameter RCP's.

YES NO ☒

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no text or other markings on the paper.



Site Name:	Gorgas Steam Plant	Date:	06/09/2009
Unit Name:	Rattlesnake Hollow Ash Pond Dam	Operator's Name:	Alabama Power Company
Unit I.D.:	Hazard Potential Classification: High Significant Low		
Inspector's Name: Grady Adkins, John Osterle, Conrad Ginther			

Check the appropriate box below. Provide comments when appropriate. If not applicable or not available, record "N/A". Any unusual conditions or construction practices that should be noted in the comments section. For large diked embankments, separate checklists may be used for different embankment areas. If separate forms are used, identify approximate area that the form applies to in comments.

	Yes	No		Yes	No
1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?		I	18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?		✓
2. Pool elevation (operator records)?	Redacted		19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?		✓
3. Decant Inlet elevation (operator records)?			20. Decant Pipes:		
4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?			Is water entering inlet, but not exiting outlet?		✓
5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?			Is water exiting outlet, but not entering inlet?		✓
6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?	✓		Is water exiting outlet flowing clear?	✓	
7. Is the embankment currently under construction?		✓	21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):		
8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation, stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?	✓		From underdrain?		✓
9. Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)		✓	At isolated points on embankment slopes?		✓
10. Cracks or scarps on crest?		✓	At natural hillside in the embankment area?		✓
11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?		✓	Over widespread areas?		✓
12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?	✓		From downstream foundation area?	✓	
13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?		✓	"Boils" beneath stream or ponded water?		✓
14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?		✓	Around the outside of the decant pipe?		✓
15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?		✓	22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?		✓
16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?		✓	23. Water against downstream toe?	✓	
17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?		✓	24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?	✓	

Major adverse changes in these items could cause instability and should be reported for further evaluation. Adverse conditions noted in these items should normally be described (extent, location, volume, etc.) in the space below and on the back of this sheet.

Inspection Issue #	Comments
1 & 6.	redacted ; monitor movement and settlement
20.	Decant water entering pipe is clear. Outlet is underwater discharge.
21.	Very minor seepage observed
23.	Small pond at downstream toe has existed since initial construction

**Coal Combustion Waste (CCW)
Impoundment Inspection**Impoundment NPDES Permit # AL0002909INSPECTOR Adkins, Osterle, Ginther
06/09/09Date Issued Sep 6, 2007, Expires Sep 5, 2012Receiving Waters: Mulberry Fork of the Black Warrior River and Bakers Creek.Impoundment Name Rattlesnake Hollow Ash Pond DamImpoundment Company Alabama Power CompanyEPA Region IVState Agency (Field Office) Address AL Department of Environmental Management (ADEM)
1400 Coliseum Blvd, Montgomery, AL 36110

Name of Impoundment _____

(Report each impoundment on a separate form under the same Impoundment NPDES Permit number)

New _____ Update _____

Is impoundment currently under construction?

Yes

No

Is water or ccw currently being pumped into the impoundment?

XXIMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION: Ash Storage

Nearest Downstream Town: Name _____

Distance from the impoundment _____

Impoundment

Location:

Longitude -87 Degrees 11 Minutes 08 SecondsLatitude 33 Degrees 38 Minutes 23 SecondsState AL County WalkerDoes a state agency regulate this impoundment? YES _____ NO X Dam SafetyIf So Which State Agency? Discharge only regulated by ADEM

HAZARD POTENTIAL (In the event the impoundment should fail, the following would occur):

 LESS THAN LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Failure or misoperation of the dam results in no probable loss of human life or economic or environmental losses.

LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the low hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the owner's property.

✓ **SIGNIFICANT HAZARD POTENTIAL:** Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard potential classification dams are often located in predominantly rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure.


HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the high hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life.

DESCRIBE REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

Considered significant since failure would result in damage to plant as well as environmental damage. Low probability of loss of life.

[illegible]

CONFIGURATION:



- ☒ Cross-Valley
- ☐ Side-Hill
- ☐ Diked
- ☐ Incised (form completion optional)
- ☐ Combination Incised/Diked

Embankment Height _____ feet
 Pool Area Redacted acres
 Current Freeboard _____ feet

Upstream - Earth Fill, RCC top redacted
 Center - Earth Fill core
 Rock Fill Downstream




Embankment Material Combination
 Liner None
 Liner Permeability NSA

TYPE OF OUTLET (Mark all that apply)

Emergency/Auxiliary Spillway - Twin Box Culvert Inlet to Baffled Chute
Open Channel Spillway TRAPEZOIDAL (5' H x 7' W) TRIANGULAR Spillway

- ☐ Trapezoidal
☐ Triangular
☒ Rectangular
☐ Irregular


5' depth
15' bottom (or average) width
15' top width



Outlet

48" inside diameter

Primary Spillway - Weir Box Intake Structure in reservoir with a redacted part of 48" CMP to outlet



Material

- ☒ corrugated metal
☐ welded steel
☐ concrete
☐ plastic (hdpe, pvc, etc.)
☐ other (specify) _____

Is water flowing through the outlet? YES ☒ NO ☐

No Outlet

Other Type of Outlet (specify) _____

The Impoundment was Designed By Southern Company

YES _____ NO X

If so Please Describe : _____

Rattlesnake